

SUMMARY MINUTES

ABAG Regional Planning Committee Meeting
Wednesday, December 7, 2016

375 Beale Street, Yerba Buena Room, San Francisco, California 94105

1. CALL TO ORDER

Pradeep Gupta, Chair and Vice Mayor, City of South San Francisco, called the meeting of the Regional Planning Committee of the Association of Bay Area Governments to order at 1:03 PM

A quorum of the committee was present.

Committee Members Present

Mark Boucher
Paul Campos

Cindy Chavez
Pat Eklund
Pradeep Gupta
Scott Haggerty
Russell Hancock
Erin Hannigan
John Holtzclaw
Melissa Jones
Mark Luce
Jeremy Madsen
Eric Mar
Nate Miley
Karen Mitchoff
Julie Pierce
Matt Regan

Katie Rice
Carlos Romero
Mark Ross
Kirsten Spalding
James P. Sperring
Egon Terplan
Dyan Whyte

Members Absent

Desley Brooks
Diane Burgis
Tilly Chang

Julie Combs
Diane Dillon

Jurisdiction

BAFPAA
Senior Vice President, Government Affairs, Building Industry Association
Supervisor, County of Santa Clara
Mayor, City of Novato
Mayor, City of South San Francisco (Chair)
Supervisor, County of Alameda
President & CEO, Joint Venture Silicon Valley
Supervisor, County of Solano
Sierra Club
Executive Director BARHII, Public Health
Supervisor, County of Napa
Executive Director, Greenbelt Alliance
Supervisor, City and County of San Francisco
Supervisor, County of Alameda
Supervisor, County of Contra Costa
Councilmember, City of Clayton (ABAG President)
Senior Vice President of Public Policy, Bay Area Council
Supervisor, County of Marin
Urban Ecology
Councilmember, City of Martinez
Executive Director, SMCUCA
Supervisor, County of Solano
Planning Director, SPUR
Assist. Exc. Officer, San Francisco Regional Waterboard

Jurisdiction

Councilmember, City of Oakland
East Bay Regional Park District
Executive Director, SFCTA
County of San Francisco
Councilmember, City of Santa Rosa (Vice Chair)
Supervisor, County of Napa

Karen Engel	Director of Economic and Workforce Development, Peralta Community College
Martin Engelmann	Deputy Executive Director of Planning, Contra Costa Transportation Agency
Nancy Ianni	League of Women Voters--Bay Area
Michael Lane	Policy Director, Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California
Carmen Montano	Vice Mayor, City of Milpitas
Anu Natarajan	Director of Policy and Advocacy, MidPen Housing
Harry Price	Mayor, City of Fairfield
David Rabbitt	Supervisor, County of Sonoma (ABAG Vice President)
Al Savay	Community & Economic Dev. Director, City of San Carlos (BAPDA)
Jill Techel	Mayor, City of Napa
Monica E. Wilson	Councilmember, City of Antioch

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

3. APPROVAL OF REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES OF OCTOBER 5, 2016

Chair Gupta recognized a motion by **Member Holtzclaw**, Sierra Club, and seconded by **Member Eklund**, Mayor, City of Novato, to approve the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) minutes of October 5, 2016.

Yes votes were: Boucher, Brooks, Campos, Chavez, Eklund, Gupta, Haggerty, Hancock, Hannigan, Holtzclaw, Jones, Luce, Madsen, Miley, Mitchoff, Pierce, Regan, Rice, Ross, Spalding, Sperling, Terplan, Whyte

No votes were: none

Abstain votes were: Romero

Absent were: Burgis, Chang, Combs, Dillon, Engel, Engelmann, Ianni, Lane, Mar, Montano, Natarajan, Price, Rabbitt, Savay, Techel, Wilson

The motion passed.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements.

5. SESSION OVERVIEW

Miriam Chion, Director of Planning and Research at ABAG, gave an overview of the meeting and future plans and schedules.

6. RESILIENCE OF INFRASTRUCTURE: WATER

Information/ACTION

Duane Bay, Assistant Planning Director at ABAG; **Michael Germeraad**, Regional Resilience Planner; and **Mike Ambrose**, Director of Regulatory Compliance, East Bay Municipal Utility District; provided an overview of the water supply challenges in the Bay Area, and presented the Lifelines Council proposal for Committee consideration.

Member Spering asked for clarification about the objective of this effort. Most cities have emergency systems in place. Do we want to know the inventory of available water in the region, so water can be moved from one area to another if necessary? Do we want to make people more aware of what they need to be prepared for? How are cities going to be integrated into this effort?

Mr. Germeraad responded that awareness and the sharing of existing information is very important. The Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) with East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) and San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) held a forum between city and water district emergency managers to discuss respective roles and responsibilities – at the meeting gaps in responsibility were highlighted and out of that meeting EBMUD and Berkeley formed a partnership to address the gap. There are other places in the region where there is a need for increased clarity on what to expect from one another in an acute shock scenario with respect to providing sufficient water supply to residents and businesses.

ABAG has done research to visualize the complexity of responsibilities. If you look in the attachments, there is a graphic, called the “barcode” that illustrates the complexity of this challenge for many cities in the region. In the memo there is also a water supply portfolio graphic showing how different sections of the region receive water. By inviting water districts to the Subcommittee meetings, ABAG is learning the complexities and challenges of sharing water from different sources. Eight large water districts are working together under the Bay Area Regional Reliability (BARR) project to create a regional picture of water supply and then list out projects with multi agency benefit – the BARR initiative and it’s water district members are producing a wealth of information we would like to export out to our member cities.

Member Spering suggested considering how the region would respond if water treatment plants are incapacitated.

Member Mitchoff asked for clarification of the action item. The first item asks to consider how long-term water demand action can be integrated into plan Bay Area development or implementation. Her thought was that this issue should remain separate from a Lifelines Council that focuses on addressing infrastructure challenges from an earthquake, drought, sea level rise, or aging infrastructure. Will the first bullet point, long-term water demand action and Plan Bay Area, be a focus of the Lifelines Council?

Mr. Bay stated that staff is recommending that the first year be focused. Of the full range of utilities and challenges that could be a focus for the subcommittee, staff selected water, and specifically water supply planning and service continuity after a

disaster. The hope is that with this focus, the Regional Lifeline Council will be to get its feet under it and decide how to deal with multi-agency and multi-topic challenges.

In subcommittee meetings and in conversations with the water districts there are clear intersections between land-use planning and water demand planning. Water districts go through a five-year cycle that in many ways is parallel to the sustainable community strategy regimen for the land-use and transportation planning. The state hasn't mandated those to be pushed together. My recollection of some of the subcommittee meeting conversations were both cities and districts saying, "Yeah, we're doing okay job with that but we could actually be thoughtful about how to do that in a more coordinated way."

Member Mitchoff said she would hate to see the Lifelines Council get bogged down with the land-use planning and water demands efforts, which are likely to be more contentious. Instead, focusing on the earthquake and disaster issues offers an area with greater stakeholder agreement and benefit.

Member Regan echoed Member Mitchoff's comments about removing discussion of water demand as part of the proposed action. He commented that people often oppose housing projects based on the premise there is not enough water, even though the data does not hold that to be true at all. The state average per capita water use is over 200 gallons per person per day, but here in San Francisco it is less than 50.

Senator Bill Dodd carried a bill last year, AB1755, that creates a state database that mandates that all water users, traders, or people with water rights have to use the same computer system so we know where the water is, who has it, who is trading it, how much it costs, so everybody is operating from the same data across the state. This baseline of information will be helpful to move water efforts forward.

We need to be mindful that what we do inside our jurisdiction to reduce risk is important but what happens outside our jurisdiction is perhaps more important in many instances. The work of the council should consider how outside shocks, like an earthquake in the delta, or new State Water Board regulations, impact the region's water.

Member Eklund said she supports these recommendations but asked to what extent is long-term water demand going to be included in Plan Bay Area 2017? The inclusion of water in Plan Bay Area was one of the recommendations identified by the Marin ABAG delegates and alternates.

Ms. Chion replied that there will be a reference in the Environmental Impact Report but nothing at the scale we think would satisfy the dialogue we are having. We are making a lot of progress in working with our water district colleagues. We need to have a better understanding of each other's reports and planning perspective. For the next Plan Bay Area, which coincides with the urban water management plan cycle, it would be a good opportunity to have more specificity in terms of what are the water needs for the growth that we are expecting.

Member Rice agreed, saying it makes sense to bifurcate the demand-side from planning and response in the wake of some disaster. It might make more sense to look at these challenges at the sub-regional scale where there is more natural connections by source and geography, especially since at the regional scale there are 130 different water districts that take every shape or form of private and public.

The technology and the way we manage water is in the dark ages. San Francisco is a little ahead in the game in terms of how we use water. We can do so much better with our use of potable water. The State should be pushing us at the local level to be more proactive given that we are going to see more drought. If Plan Bay Area is brought into the conversation we should discuss how we are consuming water and conserving water.

Member Boucher stated that he is on the infrastructure subcommittee and represents flood control agencies. He is encouraged to be involved in the conversation because flood agencies, are underfunded and need to uncover new ways to fund maintenance and new projects. He shared he would like to see the infrastructure subcommittee at some point in the future focus on flood control assets, whether it is understanding the potential impacts of an earthquake on flood control assets, or educating stakeholders on flood control challenges.

Member Whyte mentioned that she is also on the infrastructure committee and has found it confusing to lump the longer-term planning and Plan Bay Area with what is more in the emergency response arena. I think they are linked, but if we are combining them together, we may lose something.

LAFCOs could be an interesting stakeholder to bring into the conversation because they often take the lead in evaluating infrastructure capacity. When discussing water and land use I believe we need more advanced planning to preserve land for storm water detention and groundwater recharge to accommodate the more intense storms climate models are predicting.

Member Ross suggested there is a need to address some of the smaller infrastructure issues as well. Within buildings, recirculation pumps will reduce the power needed, reduce the gas needed to re-heat the water, which in turn will reduce the amount of water used.

Chair Gupta believes both long-term water supply and preventative measures to protect against earthquakes need further study. In particular to move preventative measures forward to improve performance, he would like to see more research on the likelihood of an event and the benefits of action to better allocate scarce resources. There is no arguing there is definitely a need to address our long-term water supply demand. If we're able to make investments in our long term water demand that also improve our emergency reactions, then so much the better.

Chair Gupta recognized a motion by Member Scott Haggerty, Supervisor, County of Alameda, and second by Member Jim Spering, Supervisor, County of Solano. The motion is as follows: Incorporate input from the three subcommittee meetings and the November 10th Confluence to develop a Regional Lifelines Council. Finalize the

structure composition and work with cities, counties, and public and private utilities to form the initial council. Continue the 2016 focus on water by supporting the following efforts:

- a. Continue the discussion in relationship to Plan Bay Area in the RPC but not as a focus of the Infrastructure Subcommittee
- b. Track an early joint effort by the City of Berkeley and East Bay Municipal Utility District, and develop model resources for similar efforts elsewhere in the region;
- c. Support DHS-IP and CalOES with a Bay Area-focused Regional Resilience Assessment Project

Discussion ensued.

Member Terplan wanted to clarify that the discussion of water as it relates to Plan Bay Area would continue to be discussed, but not in the Infrastructure Subcommittee.

Member Haggerty believes the work outlined in bullet one should be continued, but should be brought out of the Infrastructure Subcommittee, and taken to the RPC.

Member Mitchoff agreed to continue the conversation at RPC.

Mr. Bay wanted to point out some clarification. The choice of the word “consider” instead of “support” meant to continue the conversation on this task.

Member Mitchoff appreciated that comment, but still thinks that looking at long-term water demand is part of Plan Bay Area, and we need more elected officials and planners for that discussion.

Member Haggerty agreed with Member Mitchoff.

Member Luce supported the motion. He said that, speaking from Napa’s experience, the mutual aid effort was marvelous. Just having communities from all around help fix water pipes and it was a relatively small earthquake from a Bay Area perspective—if we had a large earthquake it would have been much more difficult. How responses would be managed in the future would be an important consideration.

Member Eklund noted that water use and demand a very important component to be incorporated in Plan Bay Area, and requested that the RPC continue to work on that or have another sub-committee.

Member Madsen wanted to make sure everybody fully understands what we are doing if we approve the motion, which he is inclined to support. He asked for clarification that, if we remove the first bullet under the continued focus that means the infrastructure committee will be working on moving ahead the idea of the regional Lifelines Council, along with these other two more disaster-oriented things. The issue of long-term supply is something that we will continue to talk about through the RPC. The question he has is what are the implications of pulling the first bullet?

Ms. Chion replied that we can work with the framework and continue to work on this task, even if it is not embedded under this infrastructure subcommittee at this point. Staff will bring you reports on how much progress we are making on that and if you feel it needs to be accelerated, needs to be incorporated or placed somewhere else, we will be getting your input at that time.

Member Madsen confirmed that he supports the motion with that in mind. He noted that his organization has long been supportive of the idea of incorporating more of the water into Plan Bay Area and how do we accommodate next generation growth where water is sustainable.

Member Spalding noted that as we form this Lifelines Council, there is a note in the staff report that indicates there would be stakeholder input invited, especially from the communities that are most vulnerable. We would want deep engagement with the poorest communities around the Bay Area, with their representatives, but also individual residents who will be very much affected by these plants.

Member Whyte commented that although this might be just a matter of parlance, if you go in this direction, you might want to rename the committee because it is not really an infrastructure committee—it is a Lifelines Council formation effort. It is misleading to continue to call it infrastructure and resilience because you are cutting out a bunch of infrastructure and only focusing on the emergency response piece.

Member Mitchoff respectfully disagreed. She stated that it is infrastructure because we are talking about pipes and roads. While the subcommittee might not discuss all systems today, the subcommittee should remain open to including components of other infrastructure systems and challenges in the future.

Ms. Chion suggested that staff take the input we have received now and bring to a future meeting a better statement of how these tasks are organized. On one hand, this is just a focus for 2017 but we understand as Member Mitchoff was explaining that the tasks are going to be broader into the future and we want to have an umbrella that carries some of the additional elements in the future but to start with a very focused task.

Member Boucher agreed that infrastructure is more than just emergency response like a Lifelines Council. He is part of the Bay Area Integrated Regional Water Management Plan and they are applying for a grant which is to reach out to disadvantage and underrepresented communities. Within a year IRWMP will have good information this committee might find valuable.

The motion passed unanimously.

7. SAN FRANCISCO ESTUARY BLUEPRINT

Information

Caitlin Sweeney, Director of the San Francisco Estuary Partnership at ABAG, provided an overview of the Estuary Blueprint or Comprehensive Conservation and Management

Plan. This Plan is a collaborative agreement on four long-term goals and 32 actions to be taken over the next five years to protect, restore, and sustain the San Francisco Estuary. This landmark update addresses current concerns and future uncertainties—ranging from rising sea levels to drought, habitat loss, and failing fish and wildlife.

Member Mitchoff asked for access to the “Freshwater Flows Report” online, so she can share this report with the Delta Counties Coalition. About water and development, there is not going to be a lot of change right away, but there could be changes in the near future. This Freshwater Flows Report is critical to those legislators who may not be as understanding or supportive of the concerns about this. She also asked for a list of stakeholders who received the Freshwater Flows Report already so we can follow up and make sure they at least read the executive summary of why flows out through the estuary into the bay and then out into the ocean are so critical to the health of this vital estuary.

Ms. Sweeney guided Member Mitchoff to www.sfestuary.org to find the Freshwater Flows Report, and will provide a list of stakeholders who have received the report already. The majority of the outreach was done by the Bay Institute.

Member Regan thanked Ms. Sweeney for a great presentation. He noted that he thinks we are on the cusp of a huge growth spurt in ferry transit in the Bay Area. The Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) is working on expanding its fleet. Genentech, as an example, is operating a boat from Martinez to its facility in San Francisco. We are seeing individual companies operating boats and there is a huge growth in private sector, Prop SF, and other smaller operators who are operating out of Richmond and other places. Assembly member Frazier wants a ferry terminal in Antioch. Everybody wants ferries and that requires dredging as far south as Mountain View where some of the larger job centers are. Do you have any thoughts on what increased ferry service on the bay might look like, what it might entail, and what it might mean for the work that you have done in this report?

Ms. Sweeney said the most direct connection to the work that we are currently doing is a boating outreach program, but it is really focused on recreational boats. Some of the work that we are doing with them includes producing more information about sensitive species, not only around the shoreline but also within the bay. And that information could be distributed much more widely. How much that will effect where the ferry routes are going or plan to go, is not clear. They certainly have other permit processes that they need to go through where the environmental impacts of the ferry routes will be considered. In terms of dredging, that is also not within my purview to talk about the impacts of dredging, but we are very focused from a more comprehensive, holistic aspect about sediment management. What sediment do we have in the bay? Where is it going? What do we need for habitats? How can we increase sediment coming into the bay, and what can we do with that sediment that is considered a problem when you are dredging a shipping channel to provide a solution to a nearby habitat that might need it? And how can we better facilitate the reuse of that dredged sediment? That is where our work is currently focused.

Member Regan noted that we should all be big supporters of ferries. The number of recreational boat users, owners, on the bay is a very small subsection of our population. The more people who are on the bay, using the bay, crisscrossing the bay every day,

the more supporters you have for the work that you do. People do not see it unless they are on it, even though it is there in front of our noses.

Ms. Sweeney agreed with Member Regan's comment. We do have an action focused on recreational use of the bay for that very reason. If you can get out on the Bay Trail or on the Water Trail and have a real connection with the bay, you are more likely to be invested in being a steward.

Member Eklund asked whether the Estuary Project looked at the impacts associated with the San Francisco Bay from septic systems or only looked at sewage treatment facilities. There are a lot of unincorporated areas that surround San Francisco Bay that still rely on septic systems. California Coastal area contamination is mostly directly associated with failing septic tanks.

Ms. Sweeney replied that is an interesting point. We do not have any action in the CCMP specifically focused on septics, but would like to look into that.

Member Whyte answered Member Eklund's question by noting that the State Water Board recently adopted a new policy, the On-Site Waste Water Treatment System Policy, which requires each of the counties to develop a local agency management plan to review their entire septic system policies and procedures and re-evaluate some of the criteria, and also take a closer look at groundwater quality as well. That is currently in the works. All these plans were due in May 2016, and are currently being reviewed one by one. The only one that has been approved so far is with Santa Clara. She will share that information with the SFEP.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Gupta adjourned the Regional Planning Committee at 3:00 PM.

The next meeting of the Regional Planning Committee will be on February 1, 2017.

Submitted:

Wally Charles

Date: January 24, 2017

For information or to review audio recordings of ABAG Regional Planning Committee meetings, contact Wally Charles at (415) 820 7993 or info@abag.ca.gov.